REMARKS

In view of the appeal brief filed on June 21, 2005, prosecution was reopened. A non-final Office Action[1] was issued on September 22, 2005. Claims 1-33 were under appeal and presently stand rejected. In this instant reply, no claims are added, canceled or amended. Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31 and 32 are independent claims.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gelman et al. U.S. Patent. No. 6,415,329 B1 (referred to hereinafter as "Gelman"). The Office Action, page 2, cited Gelman, but erroneously supplied a different patent number (5,884,027 to Garbus). This matter was clarified, and the Gelman patent number was identified, in a telephone conversation when the undersigned called the Examiner on November 29, 2005. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because every element of every one of Applicant's claims is not disclosed or suggested by this reference.

Consider, for example, claim 1:

[1] The Office Action may contain a number of statements characterizing the cited reference and/or the claims which Applicant may not expressly identify herein. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicant does not automatically subscribe to, or acquiesce in, any such statement. Further, silence with regard to rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends, directly or indirectly, from an independent claim which Applicant deems allowable for reasons provided herein, is not acquiescence to such rejection of that dependent claim, but is recognition by Applicant that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on remarks and/or amendments presented herein relative to that independent claim.

> In a network including at least one server for communicating with at least one client, a method comprising: receiving in a first address translator a data packet from a client, the data packet including a first destination address; changing the first destination address to a second destination address in the first address translator; **transmitting the data packet with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network**; receiving in a second address translator the data packet transmitted via the network; translating the second destination address back to the first destination address in the second address translator; and forwarding the data packet from the second address translator to the server using the first destination address. (claim 1, emphasis added)

As clearly recited in claim 1 there exists a method including (*inter alia*) the step of transmitting the data packet along with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network, the data packet being received in a second address translator. Against this claim element the Office Action asserts column 9, lines 24-25 of Gelman.

> "On the other end of the satellite link 44, the destination gateway application 62B receives the packets from its WLP layer 60B and forwards them to the destination TCP layer 63B." (Gelman, column 9, lines 24-27)

This section of Gelman is referring to its Fig. 2 wherein it shows satellite communication over a satellite link between its source gateway 12 and its destination gateway 16. The Office Action is apparently attempting to map Gelman's source gateway 12 against Applicant's first translator and Gelman's destination gateway 16 against Applicant's second translator. The above-quoted section of Gelman does not disclose or suggest the claim element against which it is cited for the following reasons.

The above quoted section of Gelman says nothing about transmitting the data packet *with the second destination address* from the first *address* translator via the

network. In fact, this section of Gelman merely says that its destination gateway application receives the packets. Indeed, Gelman teaches something quite different from the subject matter recited in Applicant's claims.

In referring to Gelman's claim 1, for example, it says: "upon receipt of a first of the packets at the source gateway application, *forwarding original source and destination address information* of said packet to a destination gateway application" and it further says: "from the source gateway application, forwarding *the packets* in a second protocol over the link to the destination gateway application, *address information being removed from the packets* and the associated channel identifier being appended to the packets." (Emphases added.) The channel identifier is appended to the packets at the destination gateway application (*see*: Gelman, claim 1). Claim 1 in Gelman thus says that it separates out the address information from the packet and forwards the original address information (not the packet) to the destination gateway application and, separately, forwards the packets in a second or different (WLP) protocol **after removing the address information from the packets**. This same address-removal constraint is recited in all independent claims in Gelman.[2] This is not Applicant's invention.

Applicant's claimed subject matter includes system and method for securing information transmitted between a client (110) and a server (150) in a client-server network (100). A client-side device (120) receives data from client 110 to be transmitted

[2] Claim 19 recites: "further forwards the packets, *without* the packet addressing information, in the second protocol over the link." Claim 20 recites: "source and destination addresses having been *removed* from the packets." Both claim 21 and claim 49 recite: "forwarding packets from the first gateway to the second gateway, and from the second gateway to the first gateway, using the second protocol, the packets having had addressing information *removed*."

to server 150 and modifies destination address and port information. A dynamic address translation device (140) at the server side receives the modified destination address and port information, translates this information back to the real destination address and port information of server 150, and forwards the data to the server. In reverse operation, when data packets are transmitted from server 150 to client 110, the reverse process may be used. (Figure 1; specification, page 3, line 29 - page 4, line 5; page 15, lines 24-25).

More specifically, two different network devices (address translators 120 and 140) are communicatively coupled through a network (160) such as the Internet, as shown in Fig. 1. When a client (110) generates a data packet intended for a server (150) which packet therefore includes the server's address as destination address, that packet is intercepted by the client side address translator (120). Address translator 120 maps the destination information from the server's address and port to another network device's address and port. This other address and port belongs to the server-side address translator (140). Client-side address translator 120 then **transmits the data packet with mapped destination address** via network 160 (i.e., Internet, LAN, WAN, etc.) to server-side address translator 140 which receives the packet and translates the mapped destination information back to the original (server) destination information. Address translator 140 then transmits the data packet to server 150 via another network 170 (the Internet, a LAN, a WAN, intranet, etc.). (Figure 1; specification, page 4, line 7 - page 5, line 23).

When the server 150 replies to the data packet request received from client 110, the process reverses itself, with server-side address translator 140 intercepting the reply from server 150 via network 170, mapping the destination address from that of client 110

to that of client-side address translator 120 and **sending the reply with mapped destination address** via the network (160) to client-side address translator 120. Then address translator 120 translates the mapped address in the reply to that of the client (110) and forwards the reply to the client. (Figure 1; specification, page 4, line 7 - page 5, line 23; page 15, line 22 - page 16, line 8).

The foregoing description of operation is not taught by Gelman. For example, because Gelman relies on wireless link protocol (WLP) for transmission between its gateways, which is different from TCP, and because Gelman teaches the *removal* of addresses from its packet during that transmission, it does not teach at least the claim element: "transmitting the data packet *with* the second destination address from the first address translator via the network" as recited in Applicant's claim 1, emphasis added. Moreover, not only does Gelman not teach the notion of including the address with its wireless transmission, it also does not teach transmitting from a first *address* translator. Rather, it teaches WLP transmission from a *protocol* translator which is quite different from an address translator.

As previously noted, MPEP § 2131 states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim." *See Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In this instance since

Gelman does not teach at least "transmitting the data packet with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network", the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-10, dependent from claim 1 are likewise allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*: "transmit the data packet with the second destination address to a second address translator." Against this claim element the Office Action asserts Gelman, column 4, lines 46-51 and column 10, lines 9-11.

> A second protocol translator on the second gateway receives packets via the second communications session and sends them on the third communications session. Preferably, on the second communications session, the second protocol translator receives the original addressing information of the first and second end-users. (Gelman, col. 4, lines 46-51)

> Referring back to FIG. 2, when the destination gateway 16 receives a packet from the satellite link 22 and forwards the packet to its intended destination 18, the forwarded packet at first bears as its source socket or addressing information the address of the destination gateway 16. (Gelman, col. 10, lines 9-13)

Nothing in these sections discloses transmitting the data packet *with the second destination address* to a second *address* translator. Rather, it teaches WLP transmission from a *protocol* translator which is quite different from an address translator.

The first of the above two sections merely says that the second *protocol* translator receives packets and preferably receives original addressing information *during the same session*. This doesn't say that the address information is included in the data packet. Indeed, Gelman's claims clearly teach the opposite - that addressing information is separated from the packet during its wireless transmission, and therefore Gelman cannot

transmit "the data packet *with* the second destination address" as recited in claim 1, emphasis added.

The second of the two above sections is directed primarily to the link between the destination gateway and the ultimately-intended destination which entails forwarding outgoing packets *from* the destination gateway to the ultimately intended destination. Therefore, that section is not relevant to this particular element of claim 11 which recites transmission *to* the second address translator.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this section of Gelman, or anyplace else in Gelman, does not disclose or suggest at least a processor configured to "transmit the data packet *with* the second destination address to a second *address* translator", (Emphasis added.) In view of MPEP § 2131 noted above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 12-15, dependent from claim 11 are likewise allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 16 recites, *inter alia*: "transmitting the data packet with the second destination address to a second address translator." Against this claim element the Office Action again asserts the same above-quoted column 4, lines 46-51 and column 10, lines 9-11 sections of Gelman. As noted above, nothing in these sections discloses transmitting the data packet *with* the second destination address to a second *address* translator. Claim 16 is, therefore, allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 11.

Claims 17-20, dependent from claim 16 are likewise allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*: "receive in a second address translator from a first address translator a data packet including a first destination address, the first destination address representing mapped destination address information." Against this claim element the Office Action again asserts the same Gelman, column 4, lines 46-51 and column 10, lines 9-11 sections, quoted above. Nothing in these sections disclose receiving a data packet *including* a first destination address. And "address" translator is not disclosed or suggested. Claim 21 is, therefore, allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 11.

Claims 22-25, dependent from claim 21 are likewise allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 26 recites, *inter alia*: "receiving from a first address translator into a second address translator a data packet including a first destination address, the first destination address representing a mapped destination address." Against this claim element, the Office Action asserts Gelman, col. 17, lines 28-36 and col. 18, lines 13-22 and 34-50.

> The SNAT module is responsible for modifying addressing information in TCP packets, ensuring that TCP connections are split properly and that the existence of the gateways are unknown to the hosts that use them. The SNAT knows which address information to place in TCP packets by following a set of modification rules and storing addressing information about the modifications which must be made for particular TCP connections in a translation table. (Gelman, col. 17, lines 28-36)

> Addressing information in a TCP packet is modified after the packet is matched to a translation table entry. A TCP packet matches a translation table entry when the addressing information in the translation table entry is the same that in the TCP packet. For *matched outbound packets*, the source and destination of the packet are changed to the source and destination of the original TCP connection. For *matched inbound packets*, the source and destination of the packet are replaced with a new source and destination to ensure that the packet is forwarded to the gateway application. (Gelman, col. 18, lines 13-22; Emphasis Added.)

Nothing in these sections discloses receiving from a first *address* translator into a second *address* translator a data packet *including* a first destination address, the first destination address representing a mapped destination address. The claim element against which these two sections of Gelman are being asserted clearly covers the transfer of a packet from a first *address* translator into a second *address* translator. But, the gateways 12, 16 in Gelman perform *protocol translation* (*see* col. 4, line 32 and line 46; col. 8, lines 11-12) with respect to Gelman's wireless transmission, which is not address translation as previously noted. In addition, these sections of Gelman do not teach transmitting a packet *including* an address.

Moreover, both of the above-quoted sections are describing activity in Gelman that is not related to communication between its first gateway application and its second gateway application in the first place. These two sections are discussing **TCP exclusively**, where the protocol used for communicating between the two gateway applications in Gelman is not TCP, but is WLP! For example, in the second section above it clearly discusses matched inbound and outbound packets. Those packets are coming in from real source node 10 to source gateway 12 and going out to real destination node 18 from destination gateway 16 respectively, in accordance with TCP

protocol. (Gelman, Fig. 2 and related discussion in Gelman) This portion of Gelman's operation has nothing to do with communication *between* Gelman's gateway applications. Since the Examiner is apparently associating Gelman's source gateway with Applicants' first translator and Gelmans' destination gateway with Applicants' second translator, then the above-quoted section is discussing activity irrelevant to this claim element. Indeed, in column 8, lines 18-21, it says: "Note that **because the present invention performs true protocol conversion, no TCP or IP headers are transmitted on the wireless link**. They are replaced with a small WLP header, reducing required bandwidth." (Emphasis added.) So, the above-two sections of Gelman have absolutely nothing to do with the subject matter recited in the claim element against which they are being asserted in the Office Action. For these reasons, in view of MPEP § 2131 noted above, the rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

However, for sake of completeness, consider the gateway application to gateway application communication in Gelman which is described at column 9, lines 22-27:

> The *source gateway* application 62A receives the packets from the TCP layer 63A and fonvards [forwards] them to the WLP layer 60A, *which transmits them over the satellite link 44*. On the other end of the satellite link 44, the *destination gateway* application 62B receives the packets from its WLP layer 60B and forwards them to the destination TCP layer 63B. (Gelman, col. 9, lines 22-27)

This section describes wireless activity - transmission over a satellite link - between the source gateway application and the destination gateway application. This is accomplished by way of the wireless link protocol, WLP layer 60A and WLP layer 60B. In Gelman,, column 7, lines 41-43, it says: "However, the gateway to wireless link 22 uses a special wireless link protocol (WLP) which compensates for the physical

characteristics of the satellite path." As previously noted, this special wireless link protocol does not have anything to do with address translation, and removes the address from the packet before transmitting it. Therefore this wireless link does not allow communication between its two gateway applications in a manner that would anticipate or make obvious: "receiving from a first *address* translator into a second *address* translator a data packet *including* a first destination address, the first destination address representing a mapped destination address" as recited in claim 26 (Emphasis added).

Since at least this claim element of claim 26 is not disclosed or suggested by this section of Gelman, or anyplace else in Gelman, in view of MPEP § 2131 noted above, the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 27-30, dependent from claim 26 are likewise allowable at least for reasons based on their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 31 recites, *inter alia*: "means for transmitting the data packet with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network." Against this claim element, the Office Action asserts the same Gelman, column 9, lines 24-25 section, reproduced above with respect to the discussion related to claim 1. As previously explained with respect to claim 1, nothing in this section discloses transmitting the data packet with the second destination address. And nothing in this section discloses an *address* translator. Claim 31 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 32 recites, inter alia: "a first address translator configured to...transmit the data packet with the second destination address via the network." Against this claim element, the Office Action again asserts the same Gelman, column 9, lines 24-25 section, reproduced above with respect to the discussion related to claim 1. As previously explained with respect to claim 1, nothing in this section discloses transmitting the data packet with the second destination address. And nothing in this section discloses an *address* translator. Claim 32 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested based on the above remarks. It is respectfully submitted that all claims and, therefore, this application are in condition for allowance.

If there are any remaining issues or if the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (972) 718-4800.

To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to deposit account number 07-2347. Please charge any other fees due, or credit any overpayment made to that account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2005

Joel Wall
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,648

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
c/o Christian Andersen
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H14
Irving, TX 75038
Tel: (972) 718-4800
CUSTOMER NO. 32127